UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,456	12/14/2000	Gregory Peter Davis	AUS920000777US1	1620

7590   02/10/2005

Intellectual Property Law Dept.
IBM Corporation
11400 Burnet Road, Zip 4054
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER
SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/737,456	DAVIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas E Shortledge	2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 November 2004</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15-20 and 22-25* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15-20 and 22-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   In the Amendment, received 12/02/04, applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 7, 12
and 19, cancelled claims 14, and 21, and argued to overcome the claim rejections.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 11/01/2004 have been fully considered but they are
not persuasive.

2.   The applicant argues (Remarks, page 6) the art applied by the examiner
(Watanabe et al.) does not teach or suggest providing translated pseudo language
characters, which are graphically recognizable as both the first language and the
pseudo language. In response to the argument, the examiner states that the applicant
does not fully define "pseudo language" within the disclosure, and the examiner must
read the claim in its broadest applicable form; therefore, the arguments made by the
applicant are unable to rule out the art applied within the rejection. Watanabe et al.
does teach a multibyte pseudo language, that when applied is recognizable as both
being the first language and the multibyte pseudo language characters, (col. 8, lines 5-
12).

3.   The applicant argues (Remarks, page 7), that the combined art applied by the examiner (Watanabe et al. in view of Miller et al.) does not teach a queue table to provide a reference for first language characters to be translated into pseudo language characters, and is not comprised of pseudo language character data. In response to the argument, the examiner state Watanabe et al. teaches transforming a single byte language into a multibyte pseudo language; however, a look-up table was not explicitly defined with in Watanabe et al.   The queue or look-up table of Miller et al. is able to provide locale data for substitution into an application program to internationalize the application program. The examiner argues that because the look-up table is used in a process to internationalize a application program, and that a pseudo language was already defined in the independent claims, it would be reasonable to combine the pseudo language of Watanabe et al. into the local defined look-up table to Miller et al.

4.   Responses to the amended claims are listed in the rejected claims below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Amended claims 1,7,12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim recites "…each

pseudo language character is represented by a plurality of bytes graphically

recognizable as both the first language and the pseudo language". The examiner was

unable to fully determine if it was the characters or the bytes that were graphically

recognizable as both the first language and the pseudo language. For examination

purposes the examiner read the claims to read "each pseudo language character is

represented with a plurality of bytes, and s graphically recognizable as similar for both

the first language and pseudo language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

8.   Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-17, and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Watanabe et al. (6,185,729).

As to claims 1 and 7, Watanabe et al. teach:

A device for inputting a message in a first language using an input device, said first language having first language characters wherein each character is represented with single byte (a keyboard available as an input device, input being a single byte language col. 9, lines 8-9, and col. 7, lines 46);

software for generating pseudo language character data wherein each pseudo language character is represented by a plurality of bytes graphically recognizable as both the first language and the pseudo language (creating a multi byte locale for a single byte language, (col. 8, lines 5-6), recognizable as both being the first language and the multibyte pseudo language characters, (col. 8, lines 5-12).;

inputting said pseudo language character images into said application, and displaying said pseudo language character images using said application (using multi byte English local, the developer can immediately test for problems and correct the software before the software is released, col. 8, lines 45-49).

As to claims 2 and 8, Watanabe et al. teach said pseudo language character images are graphically similar to said first language characters so as to be recognizable in said stop of displaying (creating a multi byte locale for a single byte language, it is desirable to build in features which permit ready identification of errors, col. 8, lines 5-10).

As to claim 3, Watanabe et al. teach translating each of said first language characters into a corresponding pseudo language characters (creating a multi byte language that represents a single byte U.S. ASCII character, col. 7, lines 67, and col. 8, lines 1-3).

As to claims 5 and 9, Watanabe et al. teach the first language is comprised of U.S. English characters (a U.S. ASCII English locale, col 7, lines 54).

As to claims 6 and 11, Watanabe et al. teach said inputting further comprises utilizing a keyboard (a keyboard is also available as an input, col. 9, lines 9-10).

As to claim 12, Watanabe et al. teach:

a method for testing multibyte character data in an application (testing of the multi-byte functionality of a program, col. 7, lines 55-57);

inputting single byte data in a first language (keyboard for inputting a single language, col. 9, line 8, col. 7, line 52);

translating said single byte data into a pseudo character represented by a plurality of bytes in a pseudo language graphically recognizable as both the fist language and the pseudo language (creating a multi byte locale for a single byte language, (col. 8, lines 5-6), recognizable as both being the first language and the multibyte pseudo language characters, (col. 8, lines 5-12));

utilizing said pseudo character in said application (using the multibyte English

locale to test for problems in the program, col. 8, lines 45-49).

As to claim 13, Watanabe et al. teach displaying said pseudo character using

said application (display of multibyte character, col. 8, line 10).

As to claim 15, Watanabe et al. teach the first language comprises U.S. English

(language is English, col. 8 lines 1-2).

As to claim 16, Watanabe et al. teach inputting a string of first language

characters wherein each of said first language characters are representable with a

single byte (first language is a single byte language, col. 7, lines 52-53).

As to claim 17, Watanabe et al. teach utilizing a keyboard for said step of

inputting, (keyboard for input, col. 9, lines 9-10).

As to claim 19, Watanabe et al. teach:

a program storage device embodying a program of instructions executable by the

machine to perform a method for testing a multibyte character data in an application

(program information for controlling the computer to enable the computer to perform its

testing and development function in accordance with the invention, (col. 9, lines 30-34).

inputting single byte data in a first language (keyboard for inputting a single

language, col. 9, line 8, col. 7, line 52);

translating said single byte data into a pseudo character represented by a

plurality of bytes in a pseudo language graphically recognizable as both the first

language and the pseudo language (creating a multi byte locale for a single byte

language, (col. 8, lines 5-6), recognizable as both being the first language and the

multibyte pseudo language characters, (col. 8, lines 5-12)); and

utilizing said pseudo character in said application (using the multibyte English

locale to test for problems in the program, col. 8, lines 45-49).

As to claim 20, Watanabe et al. teach displaying said pseudo character using

said application (display of multibyte character, col. 8, line 10).

As to claim 22, Watanabe et al. teach the first language comprises U.S. English

(language is English, col. 8 lines 1-2).

As to claim 23, Watanabe et al. teach inputting a string of first language

characters wherein each of said first language characters are representable with a

single byte (first language is a single byte language, col. 7, lines 52-53).

As to claim 24, Watanabe et al. teach utilizing a keyboard for said step of

inputting, (keyboard for input, col. 9, lines 9-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 4,10,18, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Watanabe et al. as applied to claim 1, 7, 12,19 (respectively) above,

and further in view of Miller et al. (5,835,768).

Watanabe et al. do not teach providing a lookup table such that said first

language characters can be used to reference said pseudo language characters.

However, Miller et al. do teach the ability to identify locale objects by a lookup

table (their corresponding representing numbers, col. 8, lines 38-48).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to combine the application testing system of Watanabe et al. with the

lookup table as taught by Miller et al. to increase the efficiency of selectively modifying

subcomponents of the globally stated cultural preference, col. 3, lines 1-9).

Conclusion

3.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thomas E Shortledge whose telephone number is

(703)605-1199. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Talivaldis Smits can be reached on (703)306-3011. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TS
01/28/2005

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER